

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. Currently, claims 1-11 has been amended and claims 13-20 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-20 will be pending, of which claims 1, 13, and 20 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**I. Claims 1-12 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2005/0050084 to Atm (“Atm”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,889,249 to Miloushev et al. (“Miloushev”). Claims 2-12 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims, to the extent maintained over the claims as amended, and submit that Atm and Miloushev, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

A. Independent Claim 1 Patentable over Atm and Miloushev

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Independent claim 1 is directed towards a method for presenting an aggregate view of native resources. As amended, the claim recites enumerating a plurality of system-scoped native resources provided by a system layer and enumerating a plurality of application-scoped native resources provided by an application isolation layer. After

determining that an application-scoped resource corresponding to a system-scoped resource exists, the application-scoped resource replaces the system-scoped resource in an aggregate view of native resources. Applicants respectfully submit that Atm and Miloushev, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Atm does not teach or suggest replacing a system-scoped resource with a corresponding instance of an application-scoped resource in an aggregate view of native resources. Similarly, Miloushev does not teach or suggest replacing a system-scoped resource with a corresponding instance of an application-scoped resource in an aggregate view of native resources. Miloushev merely describes a system that includes a file switch which aggregates file servers' responses to a client computer's request and presents a single response back to the client computer. Miloushev teaches away from the limitations recited in the claims because replacing the file servers' responses would result in an incomplete and unreadable response. Thus, Miloushev fails to teach or suggest replacing a system-scoped resource with a corresponding instance of an application-scoped resource in an aggregate view of native resources. Accordingly, because the combination of Atm and Miloushev fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome and request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

PATENTABILITY OF NEW CLAIMS 13-20

II. New Claims 13-20 Patentable over Atm and Miloushev

A. New Independent Claims 13 and 20 Patentable over Atm and Miloushev

New claims 13 and 20 are independent claims. New claims 14-19 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 13. Claims 13 and 20 recite

a computer-implemented apparatus and an article of manufacture, respectively, for presenting an aggregate view of native resources. Applicants respectfully submit that Atm and Miloushev, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 13 and 20 for the same reasons as argued above in connection with claims 1-12.

Since Atm and Miloushev, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants submit that independent claims 13 and 20 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 14-19 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of claim 13. Thus, Applicants submit that dependent claims 14-19 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass claims 13-20 to allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: November 19, 2009

/ John D. Lanza /

John D. Lanza
Reg. No. 40,060
Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 502-5002